

**MEETING BETWEEN EPA, CDPHE, DOE, and EG&G PERSONNEL to PRESENT and DISCUSS the PRELIMINARY DRAFT SCHEDULE for the CLOSURE of OU-15, "INSIDE BUILDING CLOSURES"**

March 6, 1995

**ATTENDEES**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>FAX</u>
W. Fitch, DOE/ER	966-4013	966-4871
R. Ray, EG&G	966-8557	966-8556
R. Hyland, RTG/SAIC-TMSS	966-2136	966-8086
A. Duran, EPA	294-1080	294-7559
M. Aguilar, EPA	293-0954	294-7559
C. Spreng, CDPHE	692-3358	759-5355

**SYNOPSIS**

Personnel from the EPA, CDPHE, DOE/RFFO and EG&G met this date to discuss the Preliminary Draft Schedule for the Closure of OU-15, "Inside Building Closures." The following is a brief synopsis of this meeting, which commenced at approximately 9:50 AM on March 6, 1995, at the EPA Region VIII - Conference Center, Wetlands Room - Denver, CO.

Before the meeting Mr. Duran introduced Mr. Mark Aguilar of the EPA, who will be assisting Mr. Duran.

Dr. Fitch opened the meeting at approximately 9:50 AM and proceeded to provide a description and a brief history of the OU-15 remediation effort and its associated IHSSs. Dr. Fitch was aided by Mr. Ray, Mr. Spreng and Mr. Duran.

Dr. Fitch aided by Mr. Ray presented the Preliminary Draft Schedule for the Closure of OU-15. This Schedule identified a Final CAD/ROD submittal to the Regulators on 2-29-96 with Regulator adoption on 4-18-96.

Both during and following this schedule presentation, a vigorous discussion among the attendees occurred. The following is a brief summarization of the salient points.

Mr. Spreng requested clarification on the radiation levels found in the IHSSs as reported in the Final Phase I RFI/RI Report.

Dr. Fitch assisted by Mr. Ray stated that two IHSSs failed to pass the initial screening criteria - IHSS-180, B883 90 day Interim Drum Storage Area, and IHSS-204, B447 Original Uranium Chip Roaster. The radiation survey data for IHSS-180 was used in an extremely conservative manner (The maximum identified  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  values were used with a calculated dose based upon 100 percent ingestion and 100 percent external exposure.), and using the GEN II Dose Calculation Program, as only a data compiler and processor, to determine the maximum personnel exposure - no calculated dose exceeded that allowable for radiation workers (5 rem/yr).

Both Mr. Spreng and Mr. Duran identified that the activity logic and durations associated with the Public Comment Period and the preparation of the Responsiveness Summary (RS) appeared to be incorrect. These gentlemen went on to state that a period to get the Proposed Plan (PP) into the public document centers and activities to prepare, review and resolve the comments pertaining to the Draft RS needed to be included and that these activities needed to be completed prior to the submission of the Draft CAD/ROD to the Regulators. Mr. Duran went on to further state that the Final RS and the Draft CAD/ROD should be submitted at the same time.

Mr. Spreng asked if the RCRA Permit Modification schedule logic was independent of the CAD/ROD logic.

FINAL

ADMIN RECORD

A-OU15-000220

REVIEWED FOR CLASSIFICATION/UCM	
BY	G. T. Ostfiek <i>Geo</i>
DATE	4-24-95

Mr. Ray stated that this was the logic sequence used to develop the schedule.

The discussion then turned to the OU-15 Final Phase I RFI/RI Report approval letter.

Dr. Fitch stated that the letter referenced two things: the final resolution of the OU-15 IHSSs with the D&D of the buildings and the institutionalization of the administrative controls presently in use to protect the radiation workers.

Mr. Aguilar asked about a ROD and if the pathways had been examined for contaminate migration.

Dr. Fitch provided a brief description of the pathway examination and of the ROD. Dr. Fitch then continued that DOE had been internally reviewing what situations would cause the ROD to be reopened.

Mr. Duran stated that the ROD would be revisited at five year intervals and that the ROD could be reopened or revisited at any time if the situation inside the buildings, upon which the ROD is based, should change. Mr. Duran went on to say that as long as DOE meets the occupational health standards, everything is OK, but when there is no longer a need in one of the buildings for meeting these controls, then you would revisit the ROD. This is an administrative method to provide relief and the ROD needs to include wording which describes this process.

Mr. Ray said that this language would be included in the ROD.

The question arose concerning the steps that would be necessary to close the OU. Mr. Spreng stated that the language contained in the approval letter was definitive and would satisfy the steps required to close the OU.

The discussion returned to the Preliminary Draft Schedule for the Closure of OU-15.

Mr. Duran stated that a review of the schedule indicated that the overall duration, for the PP and CAD/ROD closure process to occur, appeared to be extremely long.

Dr. Fitch stated that the remaining effort was primarily administrative in nature and that this review and approval process was essentially fixed. He went on to say that the only way to shorten the overall administrative process duration would be to reduce the durations for the activities, which define this process and too use parallel/concurrent document reviews.

Mr. Duran said that he felt that it was possible to accomplish the entire OU-15 closure effort from the preparation of the PP to the approval of the CAD/ROD in a six month time frame.

Dr. Fitch stated that through the use of concurrent reviews and reduced duration review periods, the overall administrative process schedule duration could be reduced; however, DOE has had problems in the past with document review turn-around and that if this situation should exist during this six month time frame, then all of the effort to accelerate the administrative closure process for OU-15 would be in vain.

Mr. Duran said that the six month duration could be split up as follows:

Prepare Draft and Final PPs — ~2 months

Public Review and Comment Period — ~2 months

Prepare Draft and Final RS and CAD/ROD — ~2 months

Mr. Duran went on to state that the only duration that the Regulators and DOE do not have some control over is the Public Comment Period.

Dr. Fitch said that six months to have a Final CAD/ROD approved is possible but that the EPA's, the DOE's and the State's legal reviews could substantially impact such a schedule.

Mr. Duran said a commitment from upper management of the respective DOE, EPA and CDPHE organizations that they will support such an accelerated effort will be necessary.

Dr. Fitch stated that approximately \$ 400K had been requested for the FY96 Budget to support the closure of OU-15 based upon the presently identified work scope and anticipated and realistic rates of progress. If DOE would commit to an accelerated six month schedule for OU-15 closure and then not be able to meet this schedule, for any reason, and then have to go back and request additional funding in FY96, after the fact, rather than before the fact, as they are currently doing, could result in inability to restore the money.

Mr. Duran stated that other than the technical aspects associated with the independent certification required for RCRA Closure of the OU-15 IHSSs, all of the remaining efforts are administrative in nature and that we need to work together, as a team, to complete it.

Dr. Fitch stated that he felt that the Draft PP could, most likely, be ready for public comment in approximately two months.

Mr. Ray said that for this to happen that it would require a great deal of cooperation between the parties.

Mr. Aguilar recommended that the meeting attendees attempt to identify the three biggest things that could slow down or halt the OU-15 Closure process and evaluate whether or not these things can be worked around such that a September, 1995 time frame for the OU-15 Closure is, in fact, an achievable objective.

Dr. Fitch stated that he considered that one of the biggest impediments to achieving an accelerated OU-15 Closure would be a situation where agreement is reached between all of the immediate parties and that when this agreement is placed before senior management, it is rejected, for some unexpected reason beyond any one's knowledge. Dr. Fitch then related his experience with the OU-15 Draft Phase I Technical Memorandum No. 1 (TM-1). The CDPHE had specified that risk based standards be developed for the OU-15 IHSS RCRA closures. When these standards had been developed and included in the Draft TM-1 submitted to the Regulators for approval; this risk based standards approach to RCRA closure was rejected at these higher levels within the CDPHE. Dr. Fitch continued that another obstacle to the closure of OU-15 would be when this Closure is made a part of another "fight" between the parties or is held hostage for some other non-related reason, possibly where a dispute might be occurring, i.e., RFCA negotiations, and where, due to higher priority situations arising in either the Regulators or the DOE organizations, essential personnel needed to support the overall closure effort are reassigned. Dr. Fitch then identified one additional situation that could impede progress toward closure of OU-15. This situation could occur when the funding for such a Closure would be curtailed. Dr. Fitch did not think that the probability of this happening, near term, was very high; however, when viewed in the current light of fiscal restraint with respect to Federal spending, it is a possibility that needs to be considered.

Mr. Spreng stated that considerable delay had been experienced in obtaining approvals for the Final CAD/ROD to close OU-16 and that the OU-16 closure was much less complicated and even more straight forward than the OU-15 closure, which, in itself, is not a complex effort by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Duran stated that he did not anticipate that this situation would occur again and went on to state that based upon prioritization criteria using risk reduction as a bases, then OU-15's priority is low but that using the baseline then the priority for OU-15 closure, from a cost standpoint, would be very high. Therefore, it would benefit all parties to get OU-15 closed as soon as practical.

Dr. Fitch stated that it would be a mistake on everyone's part to commit to an overly optimistic OU-15 Closure Schedule that you will not be able to achieve. The best thing, in his opinion, would be to officially adapt a more realistic and conservative closure schedule approach and then internally, within the Regulators and DOE spheres of influence, attempt to accelerate the closure process for OU-15. Dr. Fitch went on to say that DOE would rework the present OU-15 Closure Schedule using concurrent reviews and reduced duration review periods in an attempt to bring the OU-15 Closure date forward.

Dr. Fitch continued that DOE would FAX the results of this accelerated scheduling effort to the EPA and CDPHE in approximately two days.

The meeting concluded at approximately 11:35 AM.